

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

A final Office Action was mailed June 5, 2007. Applicants timely file this Preliminary Amendment together with a Request for Continued Examination.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### **I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9 - 12, 20, 23, 24 and 26 are presently pending, with claims 2 - 5, 8 13 - 19, 21, 22 and 25 having previously been canceled.

Claim 7 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

Claims 1, 11, 12, 23 and 24 are amended and new claim 27 is added without the introduction of new matter. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, with reference to Applicants' specification at page 14, lines 5 to 20, page 15, lines 17 to 24, page 24, lines 8 and 9, and page 25, lines 18 to 20.

Claims 1, 6, 9 - 12, 20, 23, 24, 26 and 27 remain pending with the entry of this Amendment.

#### **II. Objections to the Claims**

Claims 12 and 24 are objected to with regard to informalities. Applicants amend claims 12 and 24 to address the informalities, and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 20, 23, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,665,923 to Champaigne, Jr. ("Champaigne"). Claims 10 and 11





therefore stands in condition for allowance. As claims 6, 9 - 12, 20, 23, 24 and 26 each depend from allowable independent claim 1, Applicants further submit that dependent claims 6, 9 - 12, 20, 23, 24 and 26 are also allowable for at least this reason.

### III. New Claim

New claim 27 is added, and essentially includes elements presently canceled from independent claim 1. As new claim 27 depends from allowable independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 27 is allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants further submit that new claim 27 is allowable for an additional reason. Applicants submit that Champaigne fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed mini-sheet piece adhering to the second sheet at the junction of the first sheet and the second sheet and covering a portion of the back face side sheet to form a pocket between the mini-sheet piece and the second sheet for inserting and removing the interlabial pad by a user. While Champaigne does disclose a protective strip 19 that is adhered to the wrapper/film 14/20 along its longitudinal seam, the protective strip 19 of Champaigne is neither adhered to a junction of a surface side sheet and back face side sheet at a peripheral edge of the absorbent body, nor formed to provide a pocket for receiving a finger for inserting and removing the napkin by a user.

With reference to formed claim 1, the Examiner argues that Applicants' argument as to the mini-sheet not being adhered to a peripheral edge of the absorbent body is not persuasive "because element (14) joins element (20) at and between the side edges of the article." Applicants remind the Examiner that it is protective strip 19 that is compared to the claimed mini-sheet, and submit that protective strip 19 is adhered nowhere near the periphery of the absorbent body 12 as required by

